

next several years would not violate the ABM Treaty. We simply do not have the technology yet to test a system in violation of the treaty. An article in today's New York Times states that on Saturday, ground will be broken for a missile test site in Fort Greely Alaska. The article states that this test site would violate the treaty. That is not correct. Under Article IV of the ABM treaty and paragraph 5 of a 1978 agreed statement, the U.S. simply has to notify Russia of U.S. intent to build another test range. As a matter fact, the fiscal year 2002 Defense authorization act authorized the funding for the Alaska test bed prior to the President's announcement to withdraw from the treaty. As a supporter of the ABM Treaty and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I can assure you that Congress clearly had no intent to authorize an action that would violate the treaty. The technologies which would indeed violate the ABM Treaty, sea-based and space-based systems, are mere concepts that are years away from constituting an action that would violate the treaty. In sum, despite the claims of the President, there was no compelling reason to withdraw at this time.

In addition, today, the United States becomes the first nation since World War II to withdraw from a major international security agreement. In the past 50 years only one other nation has attempted such an action. In 1993 North Korea announced its intention to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty which caused an international crisis until North Korea reconsidered. The U.S. withdrawal has not caused an international crisis, but it does send a subtle signal. If the U.S. can withdraw from a treaty at any time without compelling reasons, what is to stop Russia or China from withdrawing from an agreement? Furthermore, what basis would the U.S. have for objecting to such a withdrawal since our nation began the trend? This administration must keep in mind that other nations can also take unilateral actions, but we might not be as comfortable with those decisions. Indeed, as we seek to eliminate the threat of weapons of mass destruction, this withdrawal sends the opposite signal.

As I mentioned before, the ABM treaty was the cornerstone of arms control. With the cornerstone gone, there are worries about an increase in nuclear proliferation. As Joseph Cirincione said, "No matter what some people may tell you, each side's nuclear force is based primarily on the calculation of the other side's force." If China believes its force could be defeated by a U.S. missile shield, China may decide it is in its best interest to increase the number of weapons in its arsenal to overwhelm the shield. If China increases its nuclear missile production, neighboring rival India may find it necessary to recalculate the size of its force. Of course, Pakistan would then increase its inventory to match India.

So, while there seems to be little consequence to cessation of the ABM Treaty today, if we are not careful it could be the spark of a new arms race.

As of today, the ABM Treaty no longer exists. But our work has just begun. Withdrawing from this treaty dictates that we redouble our efforts on other nonproliferation and arms control agreements. Since September 11, every American has become acutely aware of the need to eliminate and secure nuclear materials so that they do not become the weapon of a terrorist. The only way we will not regret today's action is to prove by future actions that the U.S. is truly committed to arms control and nonproliferation. The United States should robustly fund Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. The United States should pursue further negotiations with the Russians and agree to actually dismantle some weapons rather simply place them in storage. The United States should also ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

In his withdrawal announcement last December 13, President Bush said, "This is not a day for looking back, but a day for looking forward . . ." I agree. We cannot look back to a treaty that no longer exists, but we must work diligently from this day forward to ensure that the United States is taking the steps necessary to maintain the peace and security once sustained by the ABM Treaty.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

APPRECIATION FOR LENEICE WU

• Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I would like to take this opportunity to extend the appreciation of the Senate to a devoted public servant at the Congressional Research Service. Leneice Wu is retiring from CRS after 34 years of service to the United States Congress, a period spanning 17 Congresses and the tenures of eight Presidents. Only five sitting members of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives have longer terms of service to the Nation. This length of service is not only a credit to Ms. Wu, but also a demonstration of the dedication that the staff of the Congressional Research Service bring in their support of our work in Congress.

After graduating from Mary Washington College in 1968, Ms. Wu began her career with the Library of Congress as a research assistant, and is now concluding it as the CRS Deputy Assistant Director of the Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division. During her decades of service, Ms. Wu has provided research and analytical support to Members of Congress on a broad range of international relations issues, with a particular focus upon the difficult challenges of arms control. The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, START, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, nuclear non-proliferation, and chemical-bio-

logical arms control are but a few of the areas in which she has assisted Congress. A list of her reports and analytical memoranda to Congress would run several pages, but a brief survey finds: Congress and the Termination of the Vietnam War, Nuclear Proliferation: Future U.S. Foreign Policy Implications, Congress and Arms Control Policy, and U.S. Foreign Military Sales Legislation. Ms. Wu also coordinated and contributed to the eight-part Fundamentals of Nuclear Arms Control, issued as a Committee Print by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. On two occasions, Ms. Wu was detailed to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to advise in the preparation of Arms Control Impact Statements, ensuring attention to congressional intent and interests.

In addition to her research responsibilities, Ms. Wu has undertaken numerous administrative responsibilities. Prior to her present position, within the Foreign Affairs Division she has served as head of the Central Research Unit, the International Organizations, Development, and Security Section, and the Defense Policy and Arms Control Section. Following these assignments she moved on to become the Foreign Affairs Division's Program Coordinator and later Research Coordinator. Ms. Wu has also overseen a unique and vital resource to the Congress, CRS's Language Services, which provides foreign language translations for both Members and Committees. For the Liberty of Congress as whole, Ms. Wu has served as a member of the Women's Program Advisory Committee, and as both Equal Employment Opportunity Counselor and Officer.

Ms. Wu is a fine example of those many staff in this institution who work in virtual anonymity to support the important work of the Congress. On behalf of my colleagues, I extend our deep appreciation to Ms. Wu for her service, and wish her the very best in her future endeavors.●

WE THE PEOPLE: THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION 2002 NATIONAL COMPETITION

• Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, I am pleased to rise today to recognize the signal accomplishments of students from Castle High School, of Newburgh, IN, who were the Central States Regional Award winners in the 2002 "We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution" national competition.

The "We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution" program, administered by the Center for Civic Education, promotes an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of United States citizens. Students in the elementary, middle, and high school levels learn about the values and principles embodied in the Bill of Rights and the United States Constitution. The Castle High School team competed against fifty classes from throughout the country and testified before a mock